

**Remarks/Arguments**

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended.

The Examiner has rejected applicant's claim 10 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kobayashi, et al. patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,441,978). The Examiner has also rejected applicant's claims 1 and 3-9 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kobayashi, et al. patent taken in view of the Chiou patent (U.S. Patent No. 4,993,065). With respect to applicant's claims, as amended, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant's independent claims 1 and 7 have been amended to better define applicant's invention. More particularly, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the side frames of the head-mounted display apparatus each comprise an elastic member and a core member longitudinally inserted in the elastic member and the thickness of the elastic member relative to the core member is preferably arranged to be thicker on the inner side of the core member. Similarly, in claim 7, the elastic members of the left and right side frames are further defined as covering core members of the frames and as having a thickness relative to the respective core member which is preferably arranged to be thicker on the inner side of the core member.

Such constructions are not taught or suggested by the cited art of record. More particularly, the Kobayashi, et al. '978 patent discloses a head-mounted display apparatus which include side frames, but nothing is taught or suggested in the patent as to the construction of the side frames. The Chiou patent also discloses the use of side frames but in this case they are used with earphones. Moreover, like the Kobayashi, et al. patent, nothing is taught or suggested in the Chiou patent as to the construction of the side frames.

Neither the Kobayashi, et al. '978 patent nor the Chiou patent thus teaches or suggests a head-mounted display device having side frames each provided with a core member and

with an elastic member which covers the core member and has a thickness relative to the core member which is preferably thicker on the inner side of the core member. Applicant's amended independent claims 1 and 7, and their respective dependent claims, all of which recite such features thus patentably distinguish over the combination of the Kobayashi, et al. '978 patent and the Chiou patent.

Applicant's invention of claim 10 teaches an HMD including a front frame on which a display part is mounted, right and left side frames connected to two ends of the front frame by hinge parts in a foldable manner, a mount pad disposed opposite the forehead of a user, and elastic members in parts of the right and left side frames, wherein the mount pad is arranged to be urged toward a user's forehead by elastic forces of the right and left side frames and wherein the elastic members are arranged to be located on the outside of the display part in a state obtained when the right and left frames are folded with respect to the front frame.

Such a construction is not taught or suggested by the Kobayashi et al. '978 patent.

The Examiner has argued with respect to such patent as follows:

"As to claim 10, Kobayashi et al teach a head mounted display device (HMD) which includes a front frame 10M, a display part 41 (figure 4, col. 10, lines 55-56), the left and right rear frame 10L and 10R, a mount pad 2F, the hinges 10Lh and 10Rh, elastic members 10L and 10R (col. 11, lines 1-6), the temple part 2F, a forehead 2F, a viewer M (col. 11, lines 27-33), elastic force of right and left side frames (col. 11, lines 7-12)."

However, the Examiner's above argument fails to address the feature of applicant's claim 10 that the elastic members are arranged to be located on the outside of the display part in a state obtained when the right and left frames are folded with respect to the front frame. In point of fact, the Kobayashi, et al. patent fails to show or describe the positions of the elastic members or frames 10L and 10R in folded position relative to the front frame 10M. The


patent thus cannot teach or suggest that in a folded state relative to the front frame the elastic members are located outside the display part.

Applicant's independent claim 10, in reciting such feature, thus patentably distinguishes over the Kobayashi, et al. '978 patent.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicant's claims, as amended, patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Dated: September 30, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

  
John J. Torrente  
Reg. No. 26,359  
Attorney for Applicant

Robin, Blecker & Daley  
330 Madison Avenue  
New York, NY 10017  
(212) 682-9640

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 30 2003

OFFICIAL